

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/300,510**

Applicant(s)  
**Gefter et al.**

Examiner  
**Thomas Cunningham**

Group Art Unit  
**1644**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas Cunningham

(3) Jeanne DiGiorgio

(2) Amy Mandragouras

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Sep 22, 1998

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 108

Identification of prior art discussed:

Brinner, T.J., PNAS (1993), Kuo, US patent 5,328,991

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner contacted attorney to see how prosecution might be advanced in view of art that has recently come to the Examiner's attention. Brinner et al. which was appended to the Appeal Brief was not officially considered as it was not submitted prior to final rejection in an IDS. Brinner et al. teach Fel d I peptides IPC-1 and IPC-2 having the same sequences as those disclosed by SEQ ID NOS: 1 and 2. Attorney suggested that prosecution be focused on the invention as set forth in claim 108 directed to peptides comprising at least 20% of the T cell epitopes of an allergen. Attorney to consider cancellation of claims directed to other subject matter to simplify issues on appeal. Examiner agreed to cite and apply Brinner et al. and Kuo with respect to the invention as disclosed in claim 108 (as it reads on the elected species Fel d I). Appellant was informed that the Appeal Brief of record did not contain a concise explanation of the invention as claimed in claim 108 and that a "Notification of Non-compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) would be mailed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

**THOMAS M. CUNNINGHAM**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 1800**

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.